

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #250
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 11 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 250

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)
Code test speeds
: reciprocity with Bolivia?
Question about Radar Jamming
ulness of the amateur service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Jun 1994 03:48:30 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@ames.arpad
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 090694092855@138.16.64.16, Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>In article <567NnIv.edellers@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
>wrote:

>

>> Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:

>>

>> >Karl, I'll repeat it one more time. I don't know why people have such a
>> >hard time understanding this... I've never claimed that I, or anyone else,
>> >OWN a frequency. I HAVE claimed that repeater owners - even of closed
>> >repeaters - have the same rights as everyone else - to expect interference-
>> >free operation of their repeater.

>>>

>> >Does this mean that I oppose frequency sharing? Not at all. If you can
>> provide a means of sharing frequencies and at the same time eliminating
>> (or at least reducing to minimum levels) interference then you have
>> my support.
>>
>> Okay, what if I -- knowing that your machine has tone squelch -- put another
>> one on the same pair that is activated only by carriers WITHOUT your tone?
>> If one of your authorized users keys up your machine comes up and mine remains
>> dormant; if someone else does yours stays off (since there's no tone) and mine
>> goes active. Neither interferes with the other at all.
>
>The problem with this is that everytime an authorized user of Mike's
>machine keys up, even though tone-squelch is on, it'll key up your
>repeater. If someone without tone keys up you're correct in your statement
>that Mike's machine would stay off.
>
>But in the world of amateur radio it doesn't work that way.

Huh? We have machines around here with overlap. They use PL and anti-PL; in other words, one uses CTCSS activated COR, and the other uses CTCSS activated COR. They both use the same frequency, but one inverts the output of the CTCSS decoder.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 94 10:53:00 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>Ed, you miss the point. There is NO SUCH THING as an "open" repeater. By
>definition of part 97 ALL, let me say that again _ALL!!!_ repeaters are
>closed!!!!

Why do you think I put "open" in quotes, Dan?

Date: 10 Jun 1994 03:13:05 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>>Our purpose is not to merely fill spectrum for our own amusement, or to
>>serve as a living museum to radio history.

>

>If, as you keep coughing up, the use of code is just our attempt at the
>'preservation of an antique mode', then the same can be said of those who
>use radiotelephone, for as we both know, historically the time difference
>between the advent of CW and phone is ever so slight.

This argument would be interesting if we were talking about banning
some particular mode just because it was old. We're not. We're
discussing licensing requirements here.

The only communications mode that amateurs are tested for actual skill
on is CW. There is no phone test, no packet test, no *TOR test, only a
CW test. This is interesting, especially since the use of CW among non-amateur
radio services is rapidly declining. If the amateur exam must test amateurs
for some useful communications skill (not a formal requirement, by the way), then
it make sense to test amateurs on the mode(s) most commonly used by other
radio services (after all, amateurs are supposed to be a pool of trained
radio operators, ostensibly of use to other American radio services in a
time of need). Which modes are popular? Hmm... looks like phone and digital
modes are most popular. When I monitor Air Force 1 on HF, they're using SSB.
When I monitor international aero channels, they're using SSB. When I monitor
the weather stations, they're using FAX... maritime is increasingly using *TOR.

[BTW, the "coughing up" comment wasn't necessary; do you want to have a
respectful discussion or start flames?]

>Hence, I'll put away my handkey as soon as you put away your mic.

No one, not in this thread, is talking about people abandoning their
favorite modes of communication. No one is asking you to put your key
away. So, rest assured, you may keep using your key. I certainly use
my paddles on HF more than I use a microphone, but I choose to use both.

Now, please try to refute Gary's statement objectively. You may wish to
refer Part 97.1, and review the goals and purpose of the American Amateur
Radio Service.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 10 Jun 1994 14:32:02 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
news.itd.umich.edu!homerun.merit.edu!web@ames.arpa
Subject: Q: reciprocity with Bolivia?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Do US hams have reciprocity privileges with Bolivia? If you don't know
the answer, can you tell me where to look for it?

Thanks.

web...

--
William Bulley, N8NXN Domain: web@merit.edu
Merit Network Inc. Ann Arbor, Michigan

Date: 10 Jun 1994 11:29:12 GMT
From: l11-winken.l11n1.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsfeed.pitt.edu!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!gopher.cs.uofs.edu!triangle.cs.uofs.edu!
bill@ames.arpa
Subject: Question about Radar Jamming
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cr56o4.KKy@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>, donrm@sr.hp.com (Don Montgomery)
writes:
|>
|> I'd guess that they'd get you under 'obstruction of justice' or some
|> other arcane edict. Like the military's 'article 15', there's probably
|> a chapter/section/verse codified that covers any kind of jamming.
|>

Article 15 of the UCMJ (Uniform Code of Military Justice) covers Non-Judicial
Punishment. That is like appearing before a Magistrate or Justice of the Peace,
and pleading guilty rather than going to trial. It usually results in a lighter
sentence if removed from your records after a time (unlike a Court Martial)

conviction.) It does not cover any particular offense. I don't remember the Article Number, but what you are thinking of is probably "Conduct Unbefitting" Which can be anything from Murder to spitting on the sidewalk.

All the best.

bill KB3YV

--
Bill Gunshannon | de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n. Three wolves
bill@cs.uofs.edu | and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton |
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std.disclaimer.h>

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 19:52:16 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!
hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!cscsun!dtiller@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

: > The spectrum is alocated because of our benefit
: > to the nation, not to support the postal service.

: Dan,

: Other than occasional disaster-relief assistance, what benefit to
: the nation do amateur operators really provide?

: I daresay that you would be hardpressed to find one good example
: where amateur operators are a benefit - a benefit which couldn't be matched
: or even bettered by an alternative arrangement.

Isn't disaster relief enough reason in itself to allow people to voluntarily buy their own high dollar radios and provide critical comms in an emergency? Why is it that we have to bail out the local civil defense and FEMA idiots every time there's an emergency? How much is spent on hams to keep them available when needed vs the billions dumped into FEMA and the 100's of millions wasted nationwide on comm systems that fall over at the drop of a hat (or don't have power backup - duh...) It isn't just what could be done - I'm sure if the gov't wanted to waste more money they could eventually come up with a better system, but who wants that? They're getting a great deal from the hams, and lots of bang for the buck.

--
David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |
dtiller@rmc.edu | n2kau/4 | Randolph-Macon College | Fax: (804) 752-7231 |
Brady Law critique removed | P.O. Box 5005 | ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N |
due to liberal PC pressure. | Ashland, Va 23005 | 77d 31' 32.19" W |

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 94 10:58:49 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.1,<Anthony_Pelliccio-100694090557@138.16.64.16>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Tony Pelliccio <Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu> writes:

>The statement may have been a bit vague. But I still say there's an
>interference issue present, especially on the output frequency or if two
>users of the different machines key up at the same time. Wheee!

Once again, my machine would inhibit if it detects an attempt to use the coordinated repeater. The only possible way that both machines could transmit at the same time is if (A) Michael's machine was receiving a signal containing its proper PL tone AND (B) mine was receiving another signal NOT containing that same PL tone. If that happened the interference would be caused by the negligence of one of the two operators, because there would be conflicting transmissions on the INPUT frequency.

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 16:10:07 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun1.140038.23814@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <hamilton.770500266@BIX.com>,<1994Jun2.182105.2240@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <1994Jun2.182105.2240@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:
>In article <hamilton.770500266@BIX.com> hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX)
writes:
>
>And I'll reiterate that there's no way the service can justify it's
>occupancy of spectrum on the basis of "hobby".

Good. We'll finally see the end of the CB'ers on 11 meters. Oh, those spectrum wasting RC'ers, too!

>>>Our purpose is not to merely fill spectrum for our own amusement, or to
>>>serve as a living museum to radio history. Our purpose is to serve as a

Right again. Those folks who are still using that archaic phone (just about as old as CW) are only trying to preserve history.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 94 10:55:27 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.,
<Anthony_Pelliccio-100694090157@138.16.64.16>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Tony Pelliccio <Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu> writes:

>> I don't need coordination. Part 97 says only that an uncoordinated repeater
>> is obligated not to interfere with coordinated repeaters, and my "not the
>> other machine's tone" plan insures that my machine will not interfere with
>> Michael's group in this situation.

>
>It does not. Your repeater would have the same output and therefore would
>be interfering with the other machine. And in that case you're S.O.L.

Wrong. My machine would NOT transmit at the same time as the other machine;
therefore NO such interference would be caused.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #250
